



Imperial Campaigns, A. D. 285-311

Author(s): T. D. Barnes

Source: *Phoenix*, Summer, 1976, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Summer, 1976), pp. 174-193

Published by: Classical Association of Canada

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1087091>

REFERENCES

~~Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:~~

~~[https://www.jstor.org/stable/1087091?seq=1&cid=pdf-](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1087091?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)~~

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Classical Association of Canada is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Phoenix*

JSTOR

IMPERIAL CAMPAIGNS, A.D. 285–311

T. D. BARNES

THE NARRATIVE SOURCES for most of the reign of Diocletian are notoriously exiguous, confused, and unreliable. The fullest narrative of the whole reign which survives in Greek is that of Zonaras in the twelfth century, who drew on much earlier writers, either directly or indirectly, but commits some gross and obvious blunders.¹ The extant Latin accounts, though far closer in time to the events, are all variously defective or unhelpful. Lactantius must have known the essential facts, but the central narrative of his *De Mortibus Persecutorum* only commences in earnest near the end of the reign, and it concentrates on political events and civil wars to the almost complete exclusion of campaigns against external enemies.² The Latin epitomators of the later fourth century appear to depend very largely on a historical work composed ca 337, which itself already enshrined some serious errors.³ Thus Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, and Jerome all make the proclamation of Constantius and Galerius as Caesars the result of a military emergency caused by the Persian War and the revolt of Achilleus in Egypt (Victor *Caes.* 39.22 ff.; Eutropius *Brev.* 9.22.1; Jerome *Chronicle* p. 225^g Helm), whereas the Caesars were in fact appointed in 293, while the Persian War began in 296, the Egyptian revolt in 297.

In these circumstances, an investigation of the military history of the late third and early fourth centuries must be sceptical and cautious, loath to trust demonstrably unreliable authors, even where nothing else offers.⁴ Instead, though not disdaining individual items from any ancient source, it should rely primarily on the more oblique, but less dangerous, testimony of contemporary documents and writers. The point of departure can only be the full imperial titles recording the victories over

¹E.g., the African tribal confederation called the Quinquegentani become “the five Gentiani” and Carausius is “Crassus” in Theophanes, p. 8.1–4 de Boor and Zonaras 12.31. The former error derives ultimately from a fourth-century translation of Eutropius *Brev.* 9.22 (*Mon.Germ.Hist.*, Auc.Ant. 2.163).

²The work was probably written between 313 and 315, cf. *JRS* 63 (1973) 29 ff.

³Viz., the lost “Kaisergeschichte” postulated by A. Enmann in 1883, on which see recently R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1968) 105 f.; *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford 1971) 221 ff.; T. D. Barnes, *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1968/69* (Bonn 1970) 13 ff.

⁴An obvious and important principle of method, whose neglect vitiates almost all modern accounts of the period: they will accordingly be cited but rarely in the following pages.

external enemies which were officially acknowledged in an edict of late 301, on a military diploma of 7 January 306, and in an edict of April 311.

THE IMPERIAL TITLES IN 301

The imperatorial salutations of early Roman emperors are often an important guide for military chronology.⁵ But Diocletian and his colleagues automatically renewed the title of *imperator* on each anniversary of their accession, so that these salutations have lost their relevance to actual victories or warfare. The function of advertising victories passed exclusively to another element in the emperors' titulature: where emperors in the second century had taken both an imperatorial salutation and the title "Parthicus" in honour of a single event,⁶ the Tetrarchs took only the descriptive sobriquet, which they renewed for a subsequent victory over the same enemy. Hence the full form of Diocletian's name and titles when he issued the edict on maximum prices: "Imp. Caesar C. Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus Pius Felix Invictus Augustus pontifex maximus Germanicus maximus VI Sarmaticus maximus IIII Persicus maximus II Brittanicus maximus Carpicus maximus Armenicus maximus Medicus maximus Adiabenicus maximus tribunicia potestate XVIII consul VII imperator XVIII, pater patriae, proconsul." The date can be determined very precisely: Diocletian became *imperator* XVIII on 20 November 301, and his eighteenth *tribunicia potestas* expired on 9 December of the same year.⁷

Fragments of the *Edictum de pretiis rerum venalium* and an edict on currency reform from the same year allow the full titles of all the emperors to be reconstructed.⁸ Since the iterations are important, the numbers may be tabulated (Table 1). It should be noted that a small fragment recently published by K. T. Erim and J. Reynolds (*JRS* 63 [1973] 100, with Plate X) reads "Sarm. m. III" for Maximian where "Sarm(aticus) [max(imus) IV]" is conventionally restored.⁹

The victories celebrated should all pertain to campaigns which the

⁵E.g., in the later years of Augustus, cf. *JRS* 64 (1974) 23 ff.

⁶Thus Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus took the titles Armeniacus, Medicus, and Parthicus maximus for the campaigns which produced their second, third, and fourth imperatorial salutations (see esp. *BMC*, R. Emp. 4, cii ff.).

⁷The computation was first clearly explained by H. Dessau, *Eph. Ep.* 7 (1892) 429–435.

⁸For the two edicts, see S. Lauffer, *Diocletians Preisedikt* (Berlin 1970) 90 ff.; K. T. Erim, J. Reynolds, and M. Crawford, "Diocletian's Currency Reform; a new inscription," *JRS* 61 (1971) 171–177. Two fragments from Aphrodisias, long regarded as part of the price-edict, are now known to belong to the edict about currency (*CIL* 3, p. 824: Aphrodisias I, V).

⁹T. Mommsen restored "IIII" from *ILS* 641 (*CIL* 3, pp. 802–3). No one dissented.

TABLE 1: IMPERIAL VICTORY TITLES IN A.D. 301

	Number of times title taken			
	Diocletian	Maximian	Constantius	Galerius
Germanicus maximus	6	5	2	2
Sarmaticus maximus	4	3	2	[2]
Persicus maximus	2	[2]	2	[2]
Brittanicus maximus	1	[1]	1	[1]
Carpicus maximus	1	[1]	1	[1]
Armenicus maximus	1	[1]	1	[1]
Medicus maximus	1	[1]	1	[1]
Adiabenicus maximus	1	[1]	1	[1]

Evidence: *CIL* 3, pp. 802–803 (20 November–9 December 301); *JRS* 63 (1973), Plate X.

emperors waged in person against foreign enemies (not in civil wars or suppressing internal rebellions), and the titles occur in the order in which Diocletian at least took them for the first time.¹⁰ Thus it follows (for example) that the first Persian victory preceded the reconquest of Britain (during 296) and that a campaign against the Carpi followed it. The latter can thus be dated to late 296 or early 297, since an orator speaking on 1 March 297 alludes to *proxima illa ruina Carporum* (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].5.2). Moreover, the principle of collegiality obviously operates. Hence the victories celebrated in the titles of all four emperors must fall after 1 March 293, which was the official *dies imperii* of Constantius and Galerius;¹¹ the victories reflected in the titles of both the Augusti, but not in those of the Caesars, must be earlier than 1 March 293 and subsequent to Maximian's *dies imperii*, which was almost certainly 1 March 286 in the official computation employed in the edict;¹² and victories reflected in Diocletian's titles alone can be dated between his proclamation as emperor on 20 November 284 (*P.Beaaty Panopolis* 2.162 etc.; Lactantius *Mort.Pers.* 17.1) and that date. A chronological table may accordingly be offered (Table 2).

DIOCLETIAN AND MAXIMIAN, 285–293

Diocletian was proclaimed emperor near Nicomedia on 20 November 284, but did not become master of the whole Roman Empire until he defeated

¹⁰A. Arnaldi, *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo*, Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche 106 (1972) 28 ff. For the criteria of inclusion, compare Mamertinus on Maximian's defeat of the Bagaudae: *video enim te, qua pietate es, oblivionem illius victoriae malle quam gloriam* (*Pan.Lat.* 10 [2].4.4).

¹¹For the papyri which establish the year, A. Chastagnol, *Rev.num.* 6 9 (1967) 71 ff.; for the day, *Pan.Lat.* 8[5].3.1; Lactantius *Mort.Pers.* 35.4.

¹²R. E. Smith, *Latomus* 31 (1972) 1058 ff.

TABLE 2: IMPERIAL VICTORIES, 284–301

Area of victory or name of enemy	Number of victories celebrated		
	20.11.284–28.2.286	1.3.286–28.2.293	1.3.293–11.301
Germans	1	3	2
Sarmatians	1	1	2
Persians			2
Britain			1
Carpri			1
Armenia			1
Media			1
Adiabene			1

Carinus by the River Margus in the following year.¹³ He immediately confronted the problem of how to extend his effective control to the western provinces of Gaul, Spain, and Britain. The chosen instrument was Maximian, whom he invested as Caesar, probably on 21 July 285, sent to Gaul, and elevated to the rank of Augustus the following spring.¹⁴ By good fortune, two panegyrics which Mamertinus delivered in Gaul before Maximian, on 21 April 289 and 22 December 291, allude to the military activities of both emperors in some detail.¹⁵

The four victories between 286 and 293 reflected in the imperial titulature can be readily identified. Since the later speech records a Sarmatian victory of Diocletian which occurred before December 290 (*Pan.Lat.* 11[3].5.4; 7.1), but about which the earlier speech says nothing, the emperors both took the title “Sarmaticus maximus” after a campaign which Diocletian conducted in 289 or 290: the earlier date is probably preferable,¹⁶ and an allusion in a speech delivered in 297 implies that

¹³For the evidence, *PIR² A* 1473.

¹⁴Maximian appears as Augustus and as Diocletian's colleague on Egyptian documents from the spring of 286 onwards (*BGU* 1090 [31 March] etc.). But Eutropius records that he was made Caesar before becoming Augustus (*Brev.* 9.20.3), and the *Acta Marcelli* of 298 record a *dies festus imperatoris/imperi vestri* on 21 July. These two items are here accepted and combined.

¹⁵The earlier speech, *Pan.Lat.* 10[2], was recited on the *natalis Romae dies* (1.4), i.e., 21 April: the content (esp. 6.2; 12.3) indicates that the year is 289. The later speech, *Pan.Lat.* 11[3], commemorates Maximian's birthday, which he shared with Diocletian (2.2; 19.3), and it was delivered shortly after he had completed five years of rule (1.1 ff.). Since Diocletian's birthday is now attested as 22 December (*PBeatty Panopolis* 2.164; 173; 181–182; 193–194; 262: not noted in *PLRE* 1.253–254, Diocletianus 2), and the speech alludes to a conference of the Augusti in December 290 or January 291 (2.4; 4.1 ff.; 8.1 ff.), the date should be 22 December 291.

¹⁶In 289, Diocletian's movements are unknown; in 290, he left the Danube before 27 February and perhaps returned no earlier than July, cf. T. Mommsen, *Ges.Schr.* 2 (Berlin 1905) 270 f.

Diocletian was defending the new Dacia south of the Danube (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].3.3). Diocletian was also responsible for one of the three German victories, when he invaded *illam quae Raetiae est obiecta Germaniam* and advanced the Roman frontier, probably in 288 (*Pan.Lat.* 10.[2].9.1, cf. 11[3].5.4; 7.1). By elimination, therefore, the other two German victories are Maximian's defeat of the Chaibones and Heruli in 286 (*Pan.Lat.* 10[2].5.1 ff.; 11[3].7.2) and his expedition across the Rhine in 287 (*Pan.Lat.* 10[2].7.1 ff.; 11[3].5.3; 7.2).

These campaigns, however, are not the only ones to which Mamertinus alludes. Recounting the exploits of Diocletian and Maximian which gave each other joy and encouraged them to confer in Milan in the winter of 290/1, he adds two more victories:

Laurea illa de victis accolentibus Syriam nationibus et illa Raetica et illa Sarmatica te, Maximiane, fecerunt pio gaudio triumphare; itidemque hic gens Chaibonum Erulorumque deleta et Transrhenana Victoria et domitis oppressa Franci bella piratica Diocletianum votorum compotem reddiderunt (*Pan.Lat.* 11[3].7.1/2).

The “tribes bordering on Syria” are the Saraceni (cf. 5.4): since Diocletian is attested in Syria on 10 May 290 (*CJ* 9.41.9), Mamertinus should be referring to operations of spring or early summer 290 which did not receive commemoration in the imperial titulature. A triumph over Franci in 288/9 is noted in the speech of 289, which also reveals why the emperors failed to take a victory-title: Maximian himself was not in command (*Pan.Lat.* 10[2].11.4 ff., esp. 5: *a vobis proficiscitur etiam quod per alios administratur*).

The two victories reflected in Diocletian's titles, but not in those of Maximian, remain to be identified. The German victory is presumably an episode which Mamertinus had good reason to omit. After defeating the Bagaudae (*Pan.Lat.* 10[2].4.2 ff.), Maximian conducted naval operations against Franci and Saxones who were infesting the seas, with Carausius in command of the fleet (Victor *Caes.* 39.20; Eutropius *Brev.* 9.21). An orator surveying Maximian's past successes and looking forward to his suppression of *ille pirata* (*Pan.Lat.* 10[2].12.1 ff.) was well advised to pass silently over an episode in which Carausius held a high command and which led to his rebellion against Maximian (Victor *Caes.* 39.21; Eutropius *Brev.* 9.21). As for the Sarmatian victory, the hypothesis that Diocletian conducted an otherwise unattested campaign on the Danube ought to occasion no disquiet. The chronology can be deduced from three facts. Maximian assumed the purple as Caesar on 21 July 285, the German victory precedes the Sarmatian in the imperial titulature, and Diocletian was in Nicomedia by January 286 (*CJ* 4.21.6). Both victories, therefore, belong to the last months of 285.

MAXIMIAN AND CONSTANTIUS, 293–301

The panegyric to Constantius delivered on 1 March 297 (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5]), supplemented by two speeches recited in the presence of Constantine, constitutes the fullest evidence for the campaigns of Constantius as Caesar. In 293, very shortly after his proclamation as Caesar, he captured Gesoriacum and expelled the troops of Carausius from Gaul (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].6–7). He then defeated barbarians who were overrunning Roman territory near the mouth of the Rhine and forced many of them into agricultural service (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].8–9; 21.1; 7[6].4.2; 6[7].5.3). Next, Constantius recovered Britain and restored it to the Roman Empire (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].11–19), and the evidence of coins and literary sources converges to establish the date as 296.¹⁷ Subsequently, Constantius won four victories which an orator in 310 distinguishes: a defeat of *intimae Franciae nationes*; a *Lingonica Victoria*, which ought to designate a battle near the source of the River Marne; the plains of Vindonissa covered with the bones of fallen foes; and the defeat of an immense horde of various German peoples who crossed the Rhine when it was frozen (*Pan.Lat.* 6[7].6.2–4). Since Constantius was “Germanicus maximus II” in late 301, and “Germanicus maximus V” on 7 January 306 (*AE* 1961.240), the first of the victories to which the panegyrist of 310 alludes occurred between 297 and 301, the other three between late 301 and late 305.

For Maximian too, three speeches provide the fullest evidence: the panegyric to Constantius, the speech which Eumenius gave at Augustodunum before the provincial governor in the summer or autumn of 298 (*Pan.Lat.* 9[4]), and the speech which celebrates the marriage of Constantine to Fausta, the daughter of Maximian, ca September 307 (*Pan.Lat.* 7[6]).¹⁸ But the subscriptions preserved to four laws add some precise facts: they certify Maximian’s presence in Milan on 21 March and 21 December 295 (*Consultatio* 4.7; *Frag.Vat.* 292), in Aquileia on 31 March 296 (*Frag.Vat.* 313), and at Carthage on 10 March 298 (*Frag.Vat.* 41). Apart from these laws, there seems to be no certain testimony for Maximian’s activities between 293 and 296, when he advanced north to defend the Rhine during Constantius’ invasion of Britain (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].13.3). From there he marched across Gaul, fought in Spain, and then crossed to Africa to deal with a serious revolt of the Moorish tribes: the orator who spoke on 1 March 297 described the present situation as *Mauris inmissa vastatio* (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].5.2), thus dating the beginning of Maximian’s

¹⁷R. A. G. Carson, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*³ 22 (1959) 33–40, arguing principally from Victor *Caes.* 39.40; Eutropius *Brev.* 9.22.2; Orosius *Hist.adv.pag.* 7.25.6; *RIC* 5.2.516–523, cf. *Rev. Arch.* 3 (1846/7) 532.

¹⁸For the two dates, see, respectively, below p. 185 and *JRS* 63 (1973) 41 n. 143.

African campaigns to spring 297. Since the emperor was in Carthage on 10 March 298 (*Frag. Vat.* 41), it is sometimes assumed that Africa had been pacified by that date.¹⁹ That cannot be, for Eumenius implies that fighting was still continuing in the summer of 298: *te, Maximiane invicte, perculta Maurorum agmina fulminantem* (*Pan.Lat.* 9[4].21.2). Subsequently, Maximian returned to Rome to celebrate a triumph either late in 298 or in 299 (*Pan.Lat.* 7[6].8.7), and afterwards (it may safely be presumed) proceeded to one of his normal residences in north Italy (Milan and Aquileia).²⁰

THE THREE IMPERIAL VISITS TO EGYPT

Three imperial visits to Egypt must be very carefully distinguished, whose dates are 293/4, 297/8, and 301/2. Unfortunately, the first two visits have often been confused and the third denied, with disastrous consequences for modern understanding of the military and political history of the period.²¹ Nor was the full range of evidence now known available to T. Mommsen and G. Costa who first began to apprehend the truth.²²

Eusebius distinguished two revolts in his *Chronicle*, separated in the extant versions by four years: in the first, Busiris and Coptos rebelled and were destroyed (Jerome *Chronicle*, p. 226^a Helm), while in the second Alexandria with all Egypt rebelled under the leadership of Achilleus and Diocletian captured the city after a siege (p. 226^e Helm). Although the precise dates in the Armenian translation and in Jerome's version have no authority,²³ the separate entries clearly designate and describe two distinct episodes. The distinction is also apparent in the Gallic orators. When alluding briefly to the triumphs of Constantius' colleagues since 293, the speech of 1 March 297 refers to *trophaea Niliaca sub quibus Aethiops et Indus intremuit* (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].5.2), while Eumenius in the summer of 298 invokes *sub tua, Diocletiane Auguste, clementia Aegyptum furore posito quiescentem* (*Pan.Lat.* 9[4].21.2). In its context, the former passage clearly implies that an emperor went to Egypt, but such words could scarcely be used to refer to Diocletian's capture of Alexandria. Moreover, a papyrus lends support. A document from Oxyrhynchus, dated to February 295, appears to imply an imperial expedition to the south of Egypt: supplies are furnished to men who are described as

¹⁹P. Romanelli, *Storia delle provincie romane dell'Africa* (Rome 1959) 504; C. H. V. Sutherland, *RIC* 6 (1967) 23.

²⁰W. Ensslin, *RE* 14 (1930) 2506 f.

²¹E.g., W. Seston, *Dioclétien et la Tétrarchie* 1 (Paris 1946) 142 ff. (rejecting the separation of the first two revolts); *PLRE* 1.474: "the evidence for a visit in 302 is unsound."

²²T. Mommsen, *Collectio Librorum Juris Antejustiniiani* 3 (Berlin 1890) 188–189; G. Costa, *Diz.ep.* 2.1810 ff.

²³*JRS* 63 (1973) 33.

protector of the emperor(s) and *optio* of the *comites* of the emperor(s), and there are references to the legions IV Flavia, VII Claudia, and XI Claudia (*POxy* 43). As these are legions from Moesia, and a *praepositus* of IV Flavia and VII Claudia and other *praepositi* appear, it has long been recognized that the papyrus attests the presence in Egypt of an expeditionary force comprising detachments of several legions.²⁴ The papyrus also implies the presence of an emperor (whose identity remains to be established) and should be relevant to the orator's "trophies on the Nile." Nor is there any obvious difficulty in assigning the destruction of Busiris and Coptos to the same expedition.

The revolt in which Achilleus was prominent began in July or August 297, and Alexandria was captured in the following spring or summer.²⁵ Diocletian then, as Eumenius implies, remained in Egypt for some time: in September 298 preparations were being made for his impending visit to Upper Egypt (*PBeattyPanopolis* 1). He next proceeded to Syria, where his presence in Antioch on 5 February 299 is implied by one law (*CJ* 8.53[54].24, as emended by Mommsen), and certified by laws of February, March, and June 300 (*CJ* 9.21.1; 3.3.3; 7.22.2: the dates of the first two are not quite certain) and July 301 (*CJ* 3.28.25). Diocletian was in Egypt again in 302: the visit is recorded in two sources which preserve Alexandrian local traditions, viz. the so-called "Barbarus Scaligeri" (*Chr.min.* 1.290) and the Paschal Chronicle (p. 514.16–17 Bonn),²⁶ and Diocletian issued a rescript concerning the Manichees from Alexandria on 31 March (*Mos. et Rom. legum collatio* 15.3) in a year which can only be 302.²⁷

It remains to identify the emperor who visited Egypt in 293 or shortly thereafter. He cannot be Diocletian, who spent the whole of 293 and 294 in the Balkans or near the shores of the Propontis, only travelling to Syria in spring 295.²⁸ He must, therefore, be Galerius. Now Eusebius includes the titles "Aegyptiacus maximus, Thebaicus maximus" in his report of Galerius' titulature in April 311 (*HE* 8.17.3). It is customary to reject them on summary verdict.²⁹ The preceding discussion removes the

²⁴For comment on the document, E. Ritterling, *RE* 12 (1925) 1359 ff.; W. Ensslin, *Aegyptus* 32 (1952) 163 ff.; W. Seston, *Historia* 4 (1955) 292 ff.

²⁵For the evidence, *PLRE* 1.263, Domitianus 6; for discussion of the date, A. C. Johnson, *CP* 45 (1950) 15 ff.; T. C. Skeat, *Papyri from Panopolis* (London 1964) x–xiii; A. K. Bowman, *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses* (Munich 1973) 50 f.

²⁶On which, see respectively A. Bauer, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 29.1 (Leipzig 1905) 162 ff.; E. Schwartz, *RE* 3 (1899) 2460 ff.

²⁷L. Poinsot, *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* 76 (1924) 313 ff. Most recent scholars have adopted the impossible date of 31 March 297 proposed by W. Seston, *Mélanges Ernout* (Paris 1940) 345 ff.

²⁸Below, p. 186.

²⁹E. Schwartz, *GCS* 9.2.792: "die Beinamen *Aegyptiacus maximus* *Thebaicus maximus*

obstacle to acceptance. Galerius went to Egypt in or soon after 293, the fighting involved the destruction of two Egyptian cities, and Diocletian did not celebrate the victory officially as a victory over external enemies. When senior emperor (i.e., after 25 July 306), Galerius took the titles, which appear in the appropriate chronological place—between “Germanicus maximus” and “Sarmaticus maximus.” It follows that the victories were won in late 293 or early 294.³⁰

THE PERSIAN WAR

The Persian War falls into three distinct phases. First, the Persian King Narses attacked the province of Syria and a Roman army was defeated between Carrhae and Callinicum. Second, Galerius collected a new army from the Danube, marched through Armenia, captured the Persian harem, and invaded Mesopotamia. Third, Diocletian and Galerius negotiated an advantageous peace which added new territory to the Roman Empire. The bare outline is clear from a variety of sources.³¹ The chronology and even essential details are more obscure, and have so far eluded modern enquiry. The reason is only partly the recent publication (in 1964) of a papyrus which shows that Diocletian was in Egypt in September 298 (*PBeatty Panopolis* 1). A papyrus published in 1902 (*PArgent* 480) contains fragments of a contemporary epic poem on the war, which establishes two crucial facts: that the Roman defeat belongs to 296, and that it was incurred, not by Galerius alone, but in a campaign which he and Diocletian waged together. This evidence has never been properly exploited: W. Ensslin appears to have overlooked it completely,³² while those who have offered historical comments on the poem (including the editor of what is now the standard edition) wrongly assign it to the second and successful campaign.³³ For clarity, the three phases of the war will be discussed separately.

sind von Seeck mit Recht als unerhört bezeichnet;” W. Ensslin, *RE* 14 (1930) 2525–2526: “die von Eusebios fälschlich eingeführten Siegertitel.”

³⁰It may be relevant that a city named Maximianopolis is attested in Egypt, cf. R. Kees, *RE* 14 (1930) 2484 f.

³¹See the evidence collected by J. W. Eadie, *The Breviarium of Festus* (London 1967) 146 ff. Add the arch of Galerius, only accessible at the time of writing in the inadequate publication by K. F. Kinch, *L'Arc de Triomphe de Salonique* (Paris 1890).

³²The omission invalidates the central section of his otherwise valuable paper, “Zur Ostpolitik des Kaisers Diocletian,” *SBMünchen*, Phil.-hist. Abt., 1942, Nr. 1.

³³R. Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen nach ungedruckten griechischen Texten der Strassburger Bibliothek* (Strassburg 1901) 48–51; F. Cumont, *REA* 4 (1902) 36–40; G. Costa, *Diz. ep.* 2.1816; E. Kornemann, *Weltgeschichte des Mittelmeerraumes* 2 (Munich 1949) 265–266; E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit* 1². *Abh. Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl.³, 49 (1963) 79–81, no. XXII.

The first campaign

Fragments survive of an epic poem, clearly written by a contemporary, which describe two episodes from the Persian War (Heitsch, *Dichterfragmente* XXII).³⁴ Only two connected passages can be recovered, separated by about thirty lines. In the first, after what appears to be the very last word of a speech, the Persians array themselves in a vast throng from all over the east (1 recto 1–14), and news of the impending attack reaches the Roman Empire (15: οὐδὲ καὶ Ἐλλὰς ἀπυσ[τος]). The second passage commences as follows:

. . . . τ[η]λεθάρωντα κατηγόρησε κορύμβω[ν].
 τοῦν δέ κ[α]νεν Ἰταλίηθεν ἐπερρώντο καὶ ἄλλοι
 κοίρανοι, εἰ μὴ τὸν μὲν [']βηρικὸς εἴρυεν "Ἄρης,
 τῷ δὲ μόθος νήσου Β[ρ]εταννίδος ἀμφιδεδήει.
 5 οῖα] δ' ὁ μὲν Κρήτηθεν, ὁ δ' εἰναλίης ἀπὸ Δήλου
 εἶσι, Ζεὺς ὑπὲρ "Οθρυν, ὁ [δ'] ἐς Πάγγαιον Ἀπόλλων,
 τοῦν δὲ κορυσσομένοις ὅμαδος πέφρικε Γιγάντω[ν],
 τοῖος ἄναξ πρέσβιστος [ἄ]γων στρατὸν Αὔσονιήων
 ἀντολίην ἀφίκανε σὺν[ν] δ[ι]πλοτέρῳ βασιλῆι.
 10 καὶ γὰρ ἔσται αν μακάρεσσιν δ[ι]μοίσιοι, ὃς μὲν ἕοικὼς
 αἰθερίῳ [Διὶ κάρτος, ὁ δ'] Ἀπόλλωνι κομήτη.

(1 verso 1–11).³⁵

The names are easily supplied. The western emperors could not come from Italy because Maximian was detained by a war in Spain, while Constantius was fighting in Britain (2–4), but Diocletian and Galerius were together, like Zeus and Apollo (5–11). The references to Britain and Spain fix the date, even though no other source records fighting in Spain: Constantius recovered the island in 296 while Maximian defended the Upper Rhine, and by 1 March 297 Constantius was in Gaul, Maximian in Africa (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5], esp. 5.2; 13.3). If the poet's chronology is consistent, the dramatic date is no later than the autumn of 296, so that he must be describing the first campaign.

The Invasion of Mesopotamia

Although much will always remain obscure about the second campaign, it can be rendered probable that a Roman army advanced as far as

³⁴Also D. L. Page, *Select Papyri* 3 (Loeb Classical Library 1941) 542–545, no. 135.

³⁵The restorations are those of R. Reitzenstein, except in line 2, where I have substituted *τοῦν* for *τῷ*. Line 1 is obscure: Reitzenstein and Heitsch saw an allusion to a victory in Egypt (which is now unlikely), while Page translates "hung blooming (garlands) from the sterns of ships."

Ctesiphon. The route of Galerius' advance is both stated by literary sources and reflected in the imperial titles: he marched through Armenia, and through the territory lying immediately north of the Tigris, where his successes merited the titles of Armenicus, Medicus, and Adiabenicus.³⁶ The advance to Ctesiphon needs to be established by argument. There are two early items of explicit evidence. The first is the *Historia Augusta*, whose author pretends to be writing close to the event. Many assert (so he alleges) that fate will not allow a Roman emperor to go beyond Ctesiphon and that Carus was struck down by a thunderbolt for wishing to cross the boundaries laid down by fate (*Carus* 9.1). This opinion the writer controverts:

licet plane ac licebit (per sacratissimum Caesarem Maximianum constituit) Persas vincere atque ultra eos [sc. fines] progredi, et futurum reor, si a nostris non deseratur promissus numinum favor. (9.3)

An allusion to Julian in 363 appears probable,³⁷ with the possible imputation that Christians caused his failure: hence the writer should be appealing to a fact which he believes to be true, viz. that the pagan Galerius reached Ctesiphon. The second item of evidence is indirect, but derives from autopsy:

τοιγάρτοι καρπὸν ἥραντο τὸν προσήκοντα τῇ τοιαύτῃ θρησκείᾳ Μέμφις καὶ Βαβυλὼν, ἐρημωθεῖσαι καὶ ἀοίκητοι καταλειφθεῖσαι μετὰ τῶν πατρών θεῶν. καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐξ ἀκοῆς λέγω, ἀλλ' αὐτός τε παρὼν καὶ ἱστορήσας ἐπόπτης τε γενόμενος τῆς οἰκτρᾶς τῶν πόλεων τύχης

(Constantine *Oratio ad sanctorum coetum* 16, p. 177.1–4 Heikel)

The ruins of Babylon, or what passed for such, were still visible in the fourth century (Eusebius *In.Is.* 13.19 [PG 24.189]), but how could Constantine have seen them? The statement has been disbelieved and even used to prove that Constantine did not compose the speech.³⁸ The emperor, however, had been a tribune in the Roman army (*Pan.Lat.* 7[6].5.3; 6[7].3.3; Lactantius *Mort.Pers.* 18.10), and served under Diocletian and Galerius “in Asia” (*Exc. Vales.* 1.2). All the evidence falls into place if he accompanied Galerius on his march to Ctesiphon.

As for the chronology of the campaign, the *Consularia Constantino-*

³⁶Note Victor *Caes.* 39.34: *per Armeniam in hostes contendit*; Eutropius *Brev.* 9.25.1: *cum Narseo Hormisdae et Saporis avo in Armenia maiore pugnavit*; Festus *Brev.* 25: *in Armenia maiore ipse imperator cum duobus equitibus exploravit hostes*. The army appears to have returned along the Euphrates, cf. Ammianus 24.1.10.

³⁷N. H. Baynes, *The Historia Augusta: its date and purpose* (Oxford 1926) 62, 103.

³⁸So, recently, R. P. C. Hanson, *JTS* n.s. 24 (1973) 506: “it is highly improbable that he could in fact have visited either of these ruins.”

politana and the Paschal Chronicle date the Persian defeat to 297 (*Chr. min.* 1.230; p. 512.18–19; 513.19), while Joshua the Styliste dates the Roman capture of Nisibis to year 609 of the Seleucid era (*Chronicle*, trans. W. Wright [Cambridge 1882] p. 6), i.e., between October 297 and October 298. There is also the weighty evidence of a contemporary, who gives a correlation between the activities of the four emperors:

[sc. men contemplate] aut sub tua, Diocletiane Auguste, clementia Aegyptum furore posito quiescentem aut te, Maximiane incite, perculta Maurorum agmina fulminantem aut sub dextera tua, domine Constanti, Bataviam Britanniamque squalidum caput silvis et fluctibus exserentem aut te, Maximiane Caesar, Persicos arcus pharetrasque calcantem.

(*Pan.Lat.* 9[4].21.2)

The date must be summer or autumn 298: the Persian war is still in progress, and the omission of specific details implies that Eumenius had not yet heard of Galerius' capture of the Persian harem or his advance to Ctesiphon.

The peace negotiations

The political implications of the preceding reconstruction are serious. On the normal view, Galerius was defeated when he fought alone, while Diocletian and Galerius jointly supervised the successful campaign. The truth is the exact opposite: the Persians defeated Diocletian and Galerius, but Galerius won his Persian victories while Diocletian was in Egypt (from autumn 297 until at least September 298). Moreover, when the emperors returned to Antioch after their defeat, Diocletian rode in a carriage with the Caesar, dressed in the purple, preceding him on foot (*Eutropius Brev.* 9.24; *Festus Brev.* 25; *Ammianus* 14.11.10).³⁹ Contemporaries construed this as a humiliation for Galerius, and Diocletian successfully laid the blame for the Roman defeat on the Caesar alone. Galerius was a proud man (*Lactantius Mort. Pers.* 9.1 ff.), and it was not to be expected that he would easily allow Diocletian to arrogate the credit for the subsequent victories which he won unaided.

It is against this background that there occurred the negotiations, of which the *Excerpta de legationibus* preserve at least a partial description: the excerpts are taken from Petrus Patricius, who wrote in the sixth century and must therefore have derived his information from a much earlier writer (probably Eunapius).⁴⁰ The first of the two fragments shows Aphpharban going to Galerius and receiving the promise of a reply later

³⁹The episode was dismissed as an invention by H. M. D. Parker, *A History of the Roman World A.D. 138 to 337* (London 1935) 233; W. Seston, *RE.A* 42 (1940) 515–519.

⁴⁰For another probable example of Petrus' dependence on Eunapius, cf. *CP* 71 (1976) 267.

(frag. 13), whereas the second commences with Diocletian and Galerius meeting at Nisibis and sending Sicorius Probus to negotiate with the Persians (frag. 14).⁴¹ The date cannot be either 297 or early 298 (as commonly supposed),⁴² but must be the winter of 298/9 or the spring of 299.

THE DANUBIAN FRONTIER, 293–301

When Galerius assumed the purple in the spring of 293, he began to share the defence of the eastern provinces with Diocletian. The preceding section has reconstructed the movements of the two emperors from late 296 to early 299: the other eastern victories reflected in the imperial titulature of 301 (over Sarmatians twice, a Persian victory distinct from the Persian War of 296–299, and against the Carpi) can now be apportioned and dated. The argument proceeds from the numerous laws which establish Diocletian's presence at a particular place. The following is a summary of the chronological tables which T. Mommsen drew up, from the subscriptions in the *Codex Justinianus*:⁴³

293	Sirmium (January–February) to Byzantium (April), with return to Sirmium (September–December)
294	Sirmium (January–August), then to Nicomedia (November–December)
295	Nicomedia (18 March), Damascus (1 May) ⁴⁴
296–298	no certain eastern laws
299	Antioch (5 February) ⁴⁵
300	Antioch (12 February–25 June) ⁴⁶
301	Antioch (4 July). ⁴⁷

It will at once be apparent that Diocletian cannot have visited Egypt between 1 March 293 and the summer of 295: therefore, Galerius was the emperor whose presence in Egypt is implied by two items of evidence (*POxy* 43; *Pan.Lat.* 8[5].5.2).⁴⁸ But what of the Persian victory earlier than 296? It is tempting to connect it with Diocletian's journey to Syria in 295, especially since a reorganisation of the Syrian and Arabian frontier

⁴¹For a recent discussion, G. S. R. Thomas, *Latomus* 28 (1969) 658 ff.

⁴²As recently by T. D. Barnes, *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 140, 141.

⁴³T. Mommsen, *AbhBerlin* 1860.421 ff. = *Ges.Schr.* 2 (Berlin 1905) 267 ff.

⁴⁴*CJ* 5.72.3 (18 March); 5.4.17 = *Collatio* 6.4 (1 May).

⁴⁵*CJ* 8.53(54).24. The date is corrupt in the mss.

⁴⁶*CJ* 9.21.1 (12 February); 3.3.3 (26 March); 7.22.2 (25 June).

⁴⁷*CJ* 3.28.25.

⁴⁸Above, pp. 181–182.

at about this time has long been recognized.⁴⁹ Yet an inscription which bears the date of 294 styles Diocletian and Maximian “[Ger. max.,] Sar. max., Pers. max.” (*ILS* 640: near Vitidurum, in Switzerland). That should imply a date of 294 and a consequent attribution to Galerius.

All modern accounts assume that in 293 Galerius was entrusted with the defence of the Danubian frontier.⁵⁰ In fact, the evidence upon which they rely, though early and explicit,⁵¹ is valid only for the period after the Persian War (i.e., from 299). In 293 and 294, Galerius was active in the East, campaigning in Egypt and then on the Syrian frontier, while Diocletian defended the Danube. Nor did the Augustus and the Caesar exchange their stations in 295. For the defeat of the Carpi in 296, which modern scholars have ascribed to Galerius or even to Maximian,⁵² must be restored to the senior emperor: *Carporum, quos antiquis excitos sedibus Diocletianus transtulit in Pannoniam* (*Ammianus* 28.1.5).

There remain two Sarmatian victories. One must correspond to the *Sarmaticae expeditiones quibus illa gens prope omnis extincta est* to which the orator of 297 alludes (*Pan.Lat.* 8[5].5.1); and a chronicle notes *castra facta in Sarmatia* under the year 294 (*Chr.min.* 1.230). The other should derive from a campaign which Galerius waged in or after 299. Now an inscription, which styles all the Tetrarchs “Germanici maximi V Sarmat. max. IIII Persici max. II Brittanici maximi” (*ILS* 641: Bucarest, cf. *AE* 1936.10; 1966.357),⁵³ implies that Diocletian celebrated a fourth Sarmatian victory before the sixth German victory; and the same chronicle reports that the Marcomanni were defeated in 299 (*Chr.min.* 1.230). If the date is correct, then the sixth German victory, won by Constantius against Franci, presumably belongs to 300 or 301.

⁴⁹R. E. Brünnow and A. von Domaszewski, *Die Provincia Arabia* 3 (Strassburg 1909) 271 ff.; F. M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine* 2^o (Paris 1967) 169.

⁵⁰E.g., A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* 3 (Oxford 1964) 3: “The division of the empire in 293 is described by Aur. Victor, *Caes.* xxxix. 30 and Praxagoras (*FHG* IV, p. 2).” To the best of my knowledge, no modern scholar has ever contested the point.

⁵¹Lactantius *Mort.Pers.* 18.6 (referring to Galerius): *iam fluxisse annos quindecim (quibus) in Illyricum id est ad ripam Danuvii relegatus cum gentibus barbaris luctaretur;* Praxagoras, *FGrH* 219 T 1: ὁ δὲ ἔτερος Μαξιμῖνος (*sic*) τῆς τε Ἑλλάδος καὶ Μακεδονίας καὶ τῆς κάτω Ἀσίας καὶ Θράκης, Διοκλητιανὸς δὲ ὁ καὶ ἄλλων πρεσβύτατος τῆς τε Βιθυνίας ἥρχε καὶ τῆς Ἀραβίας καὶ τῆς Λιβύης καὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου; Victor *Caes.* 39.30: *Illyrici ora adusque Ponti fretum Galerio [sc. commissa].*

⁵²H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit* 2 (Gotha 1887) 137; H. Mattingly, *CAH* 12 (1939) 334 (Galerius); A. Stein, *RE* 3 (1899) 1610; O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* 1^o (Berlin 1921) 27, 452; E. Stein, *Geschichte des spät-römischen Reiches* 1 (Vienna 1928) 116 = *Histoire du Bas-Empire* 1^o (Bruges and Paris 1959) 78, 447 (Maximian).

⁵³On these inscriptions, see J. Kolendo, *Eirene* 5 (1966) 139 ff. They establish the equivalence of the titles “Carpicus” and “Gothicus.”

THE IMPERIAL VICTORIES REFLECTED IN
DIOCLETIAN'S TITLE OF NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 301

Germanicus maximus	285, Maximian (p. 178)
Sarmaticus maximus	285, Diocletian (p. 178)
Germanicus maximus II	286, Maximian (p. 178)
Germanicus maximus III	287, Maximian (p. 178)
Germanicus maximus IV	288, Diocletian (p. 178)
Sarmaticus maximus II	289, Diocletian (p. 177)
Germanicus maximus V	293, Constantius (p. 179)
Sarmaticus maximus III	294, Diocletian (p. 187)
Persicus maximus	294, Galerius (pp. 186–187)
Brittanicus maximus	296, Constantius (p. 179)
Carpicus maximus	296, Diocletian (pp. 176, 187)
Armenicus maximus	
Medicus Maximus	
Adiabenicus maximus	
Persicus maximus II	
Sarmaticus maximus IV	?299 Galerius (p. 187)
Germanicus maximus VI	?300 or 301 Constantius (pp. 179, 187)

THE TITLES OF GALERIUS

Towards the end of 301, Diocletian boasted that the tranquil world lay in the lap of deep quiet and that imperial exertions had replaced barbarian invasion with an eternal peace (*Edictum de pretiis*, praef. 5), and on 31 March 302 he denounced the Manichees for disturbing the leisure of mankind (*Mos. et Rom. legum collatio* 15.3). The emperor's protestations have been eagerly credited in the recent age,⁵⁴ and it is widely believed that "during the last years of his reign Diocletian was occupied with his struggle with Christianity."⁵⁵ But was the peace which Diocletian lauded a lasting phenomenon or merely a brief respite? The official titulature of Galerius unambiguously indicates the continuance of warfare.⁵⁶

Four items of evidence are available. First, two military diplomas. The

⁵⁴E.g., W. Seston, *Dioclétien et la Tétrarchie* 1 (1946) 10: "Dès les premières années du IV^e siècle s'ouvre une crise qui risque de remettre en question l'œuvre entière de Dioclétien. Crise toute intérieure, car la paix que gagna Dioclétien par ses victoires et celles de ces collègues, et par les réformes militaires qu'il fit, fut assurée pour plus d'une génération."

⁵⁵A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* 1 (1964) 40. He argues that, because "we hear of no more rebellions or foreign wars" after 298, therefore Rome's "external foes had been for the time being quelled" (39).

⁵⁶J. Kolendo, *Hommages à Marcel Renard* 2 (Brussels 1969) 378 ff.

one, probably to be dated 7 January 305, is very fragmentary (*CIL* 16.157 = *AE* 1958.190),⁵⁷ but the other is well preserved and gives the full victory titles of Constantius and Galerius on 7 January 306 (*AE* 1961.240: found near Grosseto).⁵⁸ The other two items also cohere closely in date. One is a letter which Galerius issued in 310 or early 311, known only from a single nineteenth century copy (*EphEp* 4.44 = *CIL* 3.6979 = *ILS* 660: Sinope). As reported, two lines preserve a relevant part of the emperor's titles:

quint., Persic. max. tert., Brett.
Med. max., Adiab. max., trib. pot.

The word before “quint.” can only be “Sarmaticus”: hence there had been three Sarmatian victories since 301, as well as Galerius' third commemoration of a Persian victory.

The final item is an imperial edict preserved in a literary source. In late April 311, Galerius issued an edict ending the persecution of Christians in his domains in the name of himself and his three acknowledged imperial colleagues (Lactantius *Mort. Pers.* 33.11–35.1; 36.3). Eusebius included a Greek version in his *Ecclesiastical History*, which commences with the full official titles of Galerius (*HE* 8.17.3 ff.). Apart from the omission of “Pius Felix” (perhaps by Eusebius himself), the manuscripts appear to have corrupted their pristine form very little:

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῦσαρ Γαλέριος Οὐαλέριος Μαξιμιανὸς ἀνίκητος Σεβαστός, ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, Γερμανικὸς μέγιστος *(ἐπτάκις)* Αἰγυπτιακὸς μέγιστος, Θηβαικὸς μέγιστος, Σαρματικὸς μέγιστος πεντάκις, Περσῶν μέγιστος *(τρίς, Βρεττανῶν μέγιστος)* δἰς, Κάρπων μέγιστος ἔξακις, Ἀρμενίων μέγιστος, Μήδων μέγιστος, Ἀδιαβηνῶν μέγιστος, δημαρχικῆς ἔξουσίας τὸ εἰκοστόν, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἐννεακαιδέκατον, ὕπατος τὸ ὅγδοον, πατὴρ πατρίδος, ἀνθύπατος.⁵⁹

A number has clearly fallen out after “Γερμανικὸς μέγιστος.” Since the diploma of 7 January 306 has “Germ. m. V,” and Constantine's official titulature reflects two German victories which he won between 25 July 306 and 311 (*ILS* 696; *AE* 1934.158), Galerius must have been “Germanicus maximus VII” in April 311. Hence “*ἐπτάκις*” can be supplied with confidence. Moreover, comparison with the preceding document shows that three words are missing between “Περσῶν μέγιστος” and “δῖς”: mechanical loss is perhaps more probable than deliberate omission.⁶⁰

⁵⁷Discussed most fully by G. Forni, *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano* 62 (1959) 247 ff. (assuming that the date is 7 January 304).

⁵⁸Published and discussed by M. Bizzarri and G. Forni, *NSc* 1959.58 ff.; *Athenaeum* n.s. 38 (1960) 3 ff., with Tavole I–IV.

⁵⁹For the readings of the mss, see E. Schwartz, *GCS* 9.2 (1908) 790–792.

⁶⁰Despite Rufinus *HE* 8.17.3: *Persicus bis Carpicus sexies*.

Finally, it may be observed that the figures "tribunicia potestate XX imperator XIX" are correct on the hypothesis that Galerius had taken an additional renewal of each title on 1 May 305, when he was promoted from Caesar to Augustus.⁶¹

Taken in pairs, and compared with the edict of 301, the four documents permit some precise deductions (Tables 3, 4).

TABLE 3: THE VICTORY TITLES OF GALERIUS, 301-311

Title	Number of times title taken		
	1. November/December 301	2. 7 Jan. 306	3. April 311
Germanicus maximus	2	5	[7]
Aegyptiacus maximus			1
Thebaicus maximus	omitted	omitted	1
Sarmaticus maximus	2	3	5
Persicus maximus	2	2	3
Brittanicus maximus	1	2	2
Carpicus maximus	1	5	6
Armenicus maximus	1	1	1
Medicus maximus	1	1	1
Adiabenicus maximus	1	1	1

Evidence: 1. *Edictum de pretiis* (Table 1).

2. *AE* 1961.240, cf. *CIL* 16.157 (? 7 January 305)

3. Eusebius, *HE* 8.17.3, cf. *ILS* 660 (310/1). "Germanicus maximus VII" is deduced from *ILS* 696; *AE* 1934.158.

TABLE 4: VICTORIES OVER EXTERNAL ENEMIES, 301-311

Area of victory or name of enemy	Number of victories celebrated		
	ca 1 December 301-7 Jan. 306	7 Jan. 306-April 311	
Germans	3	2	
Sarmatians	1	2	
Persians	0	1	
Britain	1	0	
Carpi	4	1	

⁶¹Additional renewals must also be postulated for Maximian in 293 (*ILS* 640; *Edictum de pretiis*, praef. 1) and for Constantine before 311 (*FIR A*² 1.93; *AE* 1934.158). Failure to see this crucial fact has led a recent writer to date the edict to December 311 and to attribute it to Maximinus (R. M. Grant, *Studia Patristica* 12 [*Texte und Untersuchungen* 119 (1975)], 375 ff.).

WARFARE, 302–305

Of the nine imperial victories attested between late 301 and January 306, only those won by Constantius can readily be dated and identified. The British victory belongs to Constantius' campaign against the Picts, in which Constantine participated (*Pan.Lat.* 6[7].7.1 ff.; *Exc. Vales.* 1.4). The diploma of 306 establishes the date as 305—and thus incidentally disproves the story that Constantine fled from Nicomedia in summer 306 and found his father on his death-bed.⁶² The three German victories must be the three victories to which the orator of 310 alludes: among the Lingones, near Vindonissa, and on the Rhine (*Pan.Lat.* 6[7].6.2–4). An inscription styling Diocletian “[German] ico max. VII” in 302 dates the first to that year (*CIL* 10.3343: Puteoli). Presumably, therefore, if Constantius crossed to Britain in 305, the other two German victories belong to 303 and 304.

No evidence so specific avails to date the five victories on the Danube in these years. Yet two allusions in Lactantius appear to imply victories over Sarmatians and Carpi in autumn 302 and over Carpi in autumn 303 (*Mort. Pers.* 13.2; 38.6).⁶³ It may also be relevant that Diocletian travelled up the course of the Danube in 303 on the way from Nicomedia to Rome, and in the following year, on the return journey, made a circuit of the *ripa Thracia* (*CJ* 5.73.4 [8 June 302: Durostorum]; Lactantius *Mort. Pers.* 17.4).⁶⁴

IMPERIAL CAMPAIGNS AGAINST EXTERNAL ENEMIES, 306–311

The existence of ancient accounts of the persecution of the Christians between 303 and 313 and of the civil wars between 306 and 313 has tended to overshadow the foreign warfare which followed the abdication of Diocletian (1 May 305). To be sure, the full details are irretrievably lost. But the titles of Galerius in 311 reflect several victories subsequent to 7 January 306, whose dates can be deduced from the titulature of Constantine and Licinius.⁶⁵ Besides the German victories, for which Constantine took the title “Germanicus maximus” twice, there are two Sarmatian victories, one Persian, and one over Carpi (Table 4).

The *dies imperii* of Constantine was 25 July 306, and he gained his first German victory before ca September 307 (*Pan.Lat.* 7[6].4.2; 6[7]).

⁶²Lactantius *Mort.Pers.* 24.4 ff.; Eusebius *Vita Const.* 1.21; Victor *Caes.* 40.2 ff.; *Epit. de Caes.* 41.2 f.; Zosimus 2.8.2 ff.

⁶³But see below, p. 192.

⁶⁴The ms has “strige”: on the problem of the correct reading, cf. J. Moreau, *Lactance: De la Mort des Persécuteurs (Sources chrétiennes* 39 [1954]) 305 f.

⁶⁵On the victory titles of Constantine, see now *ZPE* 20 (1976) 149 ff.

10.2 ff.; 4[10].16.5). Hence, when an inscription of 315 has the order “Sarmatico max., Germ. max., Got. max.” (*ILS* 695: Sitifis, cf. *CIL* 2.481: Emerita), two conclusions follow: one of the Sarmatian victories should belong to late 306 or to early 307, the victory over Carpi to 307 or later. The other Sarmatian victory appears to be dated explicitly to 27 June 310 (*ILS* 664: from Noricum). Since Galerius became gravely ill in spring 310 (*Lactantius Mort. Pers.* 33.1 ff.), Licinius will have been in command. Further, since Licinius, whose *dies imperii* was 11 November 308 (*Chr.min.* 1.231), is styled “Sarmatico max., Germanico max.” on an inscription of late 317 (*ILS* 679: Bisica Lucana, in Africa), Constantine’s second German victory (*Pan.Lat.* 6[7].12.1; 4[10].18.1 ff.) occurred before 11 November 308.

As for the victory over the Carpi, a date of 308 seems at first sight probable, since it leaves no trace in the titulature of Licinius.⁶⁶ However, the attested examples of Licinius’ victory titles (*CIL* 8.1357 = *ILS* 679; *CIL* 8.22119, 22176, 22259; 9.6061; 10.6966) come from territory subject to Constantine—whose own titulature often omits titles pertaining to campaigns of Galerius.⁶⁷ The date of 309, therefore, cannot be wholly excluded.

The Persian victory can be dated from an African milestone of winter 312/3 (*JLAlg* 1.3956: between Theveste and Thelepte). In this text, Constantine has the titles “Germanicus,” “Sarmaticus,” and “Persicus”: if victories won by Galerius are excluded (Constantine lacks the title “Gothicus”), then the Persian victory will be later than Licinius’ Sarmatian victory of 27 June 310. Further, the order of Maximinus’ titles on the same inscription (viz., “Sarmaticus,” “Germanicus,” “Persicus,” with no “Gothicus”) could be held to imply that the victory for which Galerius took the title “Sarmaticus maximus III” was won by the Caesar Severus between Maximinus’ *dies imperii* (1 May 305) and Constantine’s (25 July 306).⁶⁸

THE IMPERIAL VICTORIES REFLECTED IN GALERIUS’ TITLES OF APRIL 311

Germanicus maximus	293, Constantius (p. 179)
Aegyptiacus maximus	293/4, Galerius (pp. 180–182)
Thebaicus maximus	

⁶⁶Galerius was occupied with Maxentius in the summer and autumn of 307 (*Lactantius Mort. Pers.* 27.1 ff.).

⁶⁷E.g., *ILS* 8942 (315); 696 (318); 6091 (331); 705 (ca 334); *AE* 1934.158 (337).

⁶⁸This possibility was overlooked in *ZPE* 20 (1976) 155. However, it is not certain that in 305/6 Severus ruled more than Italy and Africa, cf. *Exc.Val.* 1.5 (assigning Galerius all of “Illyricum”); 9 (the only evidence that Severus received “Pannoniae”).

I am extremely grateful to Professor J. F. Gilliam who contributed much to the improvement of an earlier draft of the present paper.

Sarmaticus maximus	294, Diocletian (p. 187)
Persicus maximus	294, Galerius (pp. 186–187)
Brittanicus maximus	296, Constantius (p. 179)
Carpicus maximus	296, Diocletian (pp. 176, 187)
Armenicus maximus	
Medicus maximus	
Adiabenicus maximus	
Persicus maximus II	298, Galerius (p. 185)
Sarmaticus maximus II	?299, Galerius (p. 187)
Germanicus maximus II	?300 or 301, Constantius (p. 179, 187)
Germanicus maximus III–V	302, 303, 304, Constantius (p. 191)
Carpicus maximus II–V	?302, 303, 304, 305 (p. 191)
Sarmaticus maximus III	?late 302, Galerius (p. 191) (possibly 305/6, Severus [p. 192])
Britannicus maximus II	305, Constantius (p. 191)
Sarmaticus maximus IV	306/7, Galerius (p. 192)
Germanicus maximus VI	306/7, Constantine (p. 191)
Germanicus maximus VII	308, Constantine (p. 192)
Carpicus maximus VI	308 (or 309), Galerius (p. 192)
Sarmaticus maximus V	27 June 310, Licinius (p. 192)
Persicus maximus III	310, Maximinus (p. 192).